mercantile, part military-aristocratic order of the Muslims, but we may be allowed to use the phrase in the sense of precapitalist.) In Persia "progressive" forces are sweeping away the vestiges of older social orders, and it has been the same in Turkey, and the strength of religion has not prevailed against them. When religion is bound up with a decaying social order it loses its influence as it has done in Turkey and in Russia. In England religious elements allied themselves to the rising *bourgeois* class and religion was elastic enough to reform itself. It is a very moot question whether either Hinduism or Islam are sufficiently elastic to adapt themselves to new conditions, though there are elements in both that might be attracted to Socialism.

In India also there has been the third party. Imperialism inevitably has the effect of retarding the growth of Indian capitalism and in some cases deliberately has perpetuated feudal elements, e.g. the *taluqdars* and the Indian Princes, or, again, the continuance of antiquated institutions of a sectarian type. In the early days of British rule, officials gladly co-operated with reformers. Thus, Ram Mohun Roy cooperated with Lord Bentinck to do away with *suttee.* But later, when it became clear that British rule might be challenged, no friends or potential friends could be alienated. The administration did not dare to antagonise the orthodox* So they declared their neutrality towards all religions. Lala Lajpat Rai wanted the Government to grant i *crore* of rupees for work among the Untouchables; it was refused. Those who were responsible for the Sarda Act (to prevent child marriages) fouftd that the officials were only too often hostile or at any rate indifferent, because it might cause trouble. When the Law was passed it was widely contravened. (The Central Assembly has recently been enacting an Amendment to make it more stringent in application.) Again, it has not been possible to revise Hindu Law in regard